DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 575 PS 016 883

TITLE All-Day Kindergarten Program. Final Evaluation Report, Fiscal 1986.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, Ill.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 33p.; For Fiscal 1985 Final Evaluation Report, see PS 016 834.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Affective Measures; Attendance; *Classroom Techniques; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Kindergarten; Language Acquisition; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Participation; Pretests Posttests; Primary Education; Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS Chicago Public Schools IL; *Full Day Programs

ABSTRACT

This report evaluated the fourth year of operation (1985-1986) of the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program. The goals of this program were that the children attending show growth in reading readiness, acquisition of number concepts, and affective development. Principal findings note that (1) attendance rates were higher than citywide kindergarten rates; (2) there was a heavy academic emphasis in all areas, a finding which conflicts with recent research in early childhood education; (3) children made academic gains of 6-8 months in six months of instruction; (4) parent involvement in their child's school resulted in significant differences in children's academic gains; and (5) children's affective gains increased significantly. Recommendations include (1) establishing interest and learning centers and including dramatization to replace drill, isolated skill development, and ditto sheets; (2) including daily experiences with books; (3) including free writing by children, focussing on meaning rather than spelling and mechanics; (4) including language experience activities; (5) providing opportunities for extended conversations; (6) involving more parents in their child's education both at home and at school; and (7) possibly requiring an early childhood endorsement for teachers in order to assure that they are aware of developmentally appropriate activities for 5-year-olds. (PCB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS'

ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED287575

Fiscal 1986

PS 016888

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carole Perlman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ECIA

MANFORD BYRD, JR.
General Superintendent of Schools
June 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

BUREAU OF ECIA PROGRAM EVALUATION

EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT

CHAPTER 2

ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

EVALUATION REPORT, FISCAL 1986

Chicago Public Schools
Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

June, 1987

BOARD OF EDUCATION
CITY OF CHICAGO

Mr. Frank Gardner, President
Mr. William M. Farrow, Vice-President

Clark Burrus
Ms. Linda Coronado
Ms. Frances Davis
Mrs. Mattie Hopkins
George Munoz
Mrs. Patricia O'Hern
Michael Penn
Mrs. Myrna E. Salazar
Mrs. Winnie Slusser

Chicago Public Schools

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

Howard Denton
Assistant to the General Superintendent

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, religion, age, handicaps unrelated to ability, or sex in its educational program or employment policies or practices.

Project Directors: Mrs. Velma Thomas, Director, Bureau of Early Childhood Programs

Mrs. Dorothy Kellberg, Administrator of the Chapter 2 Program

Participating Schools: George Washington Carver Primary/Phyllis Wheatley CPC
Principal: Dr. Alma C. Jones

Matthew A. Henson/Milton L. Olive CPC
Principal: Dr. Joseph L. Gehrman

Jens Jensen/Dorie Miller CPC
Principal: Mr. Wayne Hoffman

William H. King/Charles Dickens CPC
Principal: Dr. Dolores M. Eder

Genevieve Melody/Nathaniel Cole CPC
Principal: Mrs. Jewel E. Koch

Daniel Webster/Lorraine Hansberry CPC
Principal: Mr. James E. Sanders

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The program evaluated in this report was funded under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, implemented by the Bureau of Early Childhood Programs, Office of Instruction Services, and administered by the Bureau of Special Programs, Department of Government Funded Programs.

The evaluation project was conducted by the Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation, Chapter 2 unit, coordinated by Geraldine L. Oberman with Dr. Nancy Mavrogenes as the evaluation specialist. Staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation provided clerical, technical, and supportive assistance.

Fred Schuster, Director
Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY vii

DESCRIPTION 1

EVALUATION QUESTIONS 3

Attendance 3

Instructional Methods and Activities 3

Achievement Outcomes 9

Parent Involvement 9

Affective Growth 13

Perceptions of Participants 14

IMPLEMENTATION 17

RECOMMENDATIONS 19

REFERENCES 23

TABLES

1-- Classes and Membership Data 2

2-- Pupil Attendance 4

3-- Results on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills 10

1986 Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program Evaluation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report evaluates the fourth year of operation (1985-1986) of the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten (ADK) program. The goals of the program were 1) for the educationally disadvantaged five-year-olds enrolled to show growth in reading readiness, number concepts, and affective areas and 2) for increased numbers of parents to participate in the program . Twenty-three classes provided Chapter 2 ADK for 580 pupils in the six original Child-Parent Center (CPC) sites. About 14 of these classes consisted of children who had had one or two previous years in the CPCs and 9 of children who were having their first school experience. The classes for children having their first school experience were called "home-school" classes because they were part of the elementary schools to which the CPCs were attached.

The Chapter 2 ADK program is basically sound. It fits in with current research that shows that ADK can produce significantly greater gains than half-day kindergarten, that basic skill gains are enduring, and that pupils of lower socio-economic backgrounds appear to particularly benefit from ADK. There is evidence that early childhood programs for disadvantaged children can reduce the need for later placement in special education and reduce the number of children retained in a grade. The economic savings to a school district have been estimated as out-weighing the costs by seven times.

The principal findings of this report are as follows:

- Attendance rates for Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergartners remained high, with 1986 about the same as 1985. For the fourth straight year Chapter 2 rates were higher than citywide kindergarten rates. The rate of Chapter 2 ADK teacher attendance, although slightly down from 1985, was higher than the overall attendance rate of all professional staff citywide.

- Instructional methods and activities were evaluated in terms of recent research on early childhood education. This research, reacting against the heavy academic emphasis which has appeared in kindergarten over the last 20 years, recommends a developmentally appropriate child-centered approach which encourages children's exploration in a failure-free environment and bases instruction on children's interests rather than on adult learning priorities. Such an orientation is especially essential for loosely structured areas such as writing composition and reading comprehension. In contrast, observations of the Chapter 2 ADK program revealed a heavily academic emphasis in all subject areas. What was observed consisted of predominantly teacher-directed activities, little free choice or free play for children, worksheets for approximately half of the instructional time, infrequently used or nonexistent interest centers, a phonics-oriented approach to reading which did not transmit the joy of reading, writing conceived of as only handwriting and copying, little oral expression beyond just a few words, and those children who finished their work first not provided with interesting and individualized independent work.

- Results on five subtests of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), given as a pretest in October and a posttest in May, showed that the median gain of Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergartners was six to eight months in six months of instruction, except for language, where the growth was less, as it has been in all years. Below norms on the pretest in all areas except word analysis, the median scores of these children were at or above norms in word analysis, math, and listening (CPC children only) by the posttest.

- Children's test scores were analyzed in several ways to see if their parents' involvement in their schools (as reported on the parent questionnaires) made a difference. The findings were these:

  1) For the third straight year a statistically significant difference appeared between the gain scores of children whose parents said they were active in the classroom and those whose parents said they were inactive. This difference, in favor of children of active parents, was three months in listening for both CPC and home-school children and three months in vocabulary for home-school children. As in the past, the growth areas all had to do with language.

  2) Significant gain score differences of four months were found on the listening subtest in favor of children whose parents said they participated more in school activities, communicated more with teachers, and helped their children more with homework.

  3) Children of parents who said they often took their children to the library made mean gains on the language subtest three months higher than those who did not go often.

  4) Home-school children whose parents said they read to them often gained four more months on the language subtest than home-school children whose parents said they read to them less often.

  5) A final analysis compared the gain scores for children whose parents said they had conducted certain activities at home with their children and those whose parents said they had not conducted the activities. The strongest gain differences (three to five months) appeared on both the language and listening subtests for parents taking their children to the library. Other activities which made a difference were reading to children (on the language and listening subtests), playing reading and math games (for CPC children on the word analysis subtest), and both helping with handwriting and providing children with writing supplies (on the vocabulary subtest).

- Parents' reactions on their questionnaires to the Chapter 2 ADK program were highly favorable. They said that they and their children liked the program and had learned a lot through the year. They were pleased with the teachers' attitudes toward their children and felt that their children had learned to get along with other children. They also indicated more participation in their children's schools this year than

last year, better communication with the teachers, and more help with their children's homework. As usual, CPC parents indicated more involvement than home-school parents. Several reasons for this lesser involvement by home-school parents might be that all schools have not determined which staff person is primarily responsible for involving these parents nor do all schools require their participation.

- The Affective Rating Scale, developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation to measure children's affective growth, was filled out by teachers for each child in October as a pretest and in June as a posttest. An analysis of the ratings on these scales showed that the total mean gain for all children was highly significant. Although there was little difference in gains by gender, females were rated significantly higher on both the pre and posttest.

- On their questionnaires Chapter 2 ADK teachers showed an appreciation for the greater amount of time their program allowed them for enrichment and intensity of teaching. They were aware, however, of the academic and physical pressures the program placed on the children. The most frequent suggestion for program improvement made by the parent resource teachers on their questionnaires was stricter guidelines and requirements for parent participation.

- The implementation of this program proceeded smoothly in 1986 for the most part, with qualified teachers and aides in the classrooms, supplies available, and inservices provided regularly. The problems noted had to do with the late provision of two aides and the lack of space.

In order to improve and make the Chapter 2 ADK program even stronger than it is, the following recommendations are made on the basis of these findings. It might be added that the recommendations could well apply to all kindergartens, not just Chapter 2.

- Less well-structured subject areas such as reading comprehension, oral expression, creativity, and writing composition require more developmentally appropriate activities than drill, isolated skill development, and ditto sheets. The following kinds of holistic and hands-on experiences should be provided much more frequently than they are:

  1) Dramatic and free play in areas set up in the room such as housekeeping, doctor's office, post office, grocery store;

  2) Dramatization of favorite stories and nursery rhymes read to the class and of stories dictated by the children themselves;

  3) Interest centers with their contents changed every other week and used as an integral part of instruction, not just as places to go when work is finished.

- These kinds of activities should be included in reading instruction to show children that reading is fun and what books are:

1) Teachers reading to the class every day, having carefully previewed the books to be read;

2) Children allowed to take books home from school;

3) Book corners set up in rooms for children to browse through books independently;

4) Teachers working with neighborhood libraries to take advantage of their programs and activities.

- Writing instruction should include frequent free writing by the children in whatever way they are able. They should think first before they write, read their finished writing to someone, and focus on meaning instead of spelling and mechanics. Language experience activities (children dictating to the teacher) also concentrate on communication and show the relationship between reading and writing. These kinds of writing should be published as homemade books for the whole class.

- Show and Tell and extended conversation should be promoted in order to strengthen oral expression.

- All principals, head teachers, parent resource teachers, and classroom teachers must work together to involve parents in their children's schools. Specific responsibility for involving all parents must be assigned, and parents must be taught how to work in the classrooms and how to help their children at home. Activities that according to our analyses are especially valuable are parents reading to children every day, taking children to the library to get library cards and check out books, providing children with writing supplies and letting them write however they are able, and cooking with children.

- Teachers working in this Chapter 2 ADK (and in all kindergartens) might be required to have an early childhood endorsement on their kindergarten/primary certificates. This might assure that the teachers are aware of developmentally appropriate activities for five-year-olds and thus might help make kindergarten different from first grade.

The Chapter 2 ADK program exhibits numerous strengths: children gaining in word analysis and math on the ITBS and growing in affective areas, good pupil and teacher attendance, innovative efforts to involve parents, continual inservicing, adequate availability of supplies, favorable reactions on the part of all participants. The recommendations made in this report should make the program even stronger, especially in the crucial area of language development, and thus give these disadvantaged children more opportunity to become productive members of society.

Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program

Final Evaluation Report 1986

DESCRIPTION

Since December 1982, an all-day kindergarten offering a five and a half hour day has been in place at the six original sites of the Child-Parent (CPC) Program. The goals of this all-day kindergarten (ADK) have been for the educationally disadvantaged five-year-olds enrolled to show growth in reading readiness, number concepts, and affective areas and for increased numbers of parents to participate in the program. For fiscal 1986, ECIA Chapter 2 funded 12 of the 24 teachers in this program and all of the teacher aides. The rest of the funding came from Chapter 1 and from Chicago Public School general funds.

The principals at each site were responsible for the initiation of the program at the local level and for its general supervision. The CPC head teachers at each school were in charge of the day-to-day operation. At one school the assistant principal shared some administrative duties. The head teachers also provided inservice and support services, as did the parent resource teachers, the Bureau of Early Childhood administrator and coordinator, and staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation. The parent volunteer component of the program was established in conjunction with the total parent program that is under the direction of the curriculum-parent teachers of the CPC Adaption/Expansion Program (CPCX) and the CPC parent resource teachers. Many classes had the services of the school librarian, a school/community representative (SCR), and a gym teacher. A nurse and clerk were also available at some sites.

As shown in Table 1, almost 600 pupils were provided Chapter 2 ADK in six schools. For administrative purposes, 11 of the 23 classes were officially affiliated with the CPCs and 12 (called "home-school" classes) were part of the schools to which the CPCs are attached. In actuality, however, CPC children were often put in home-school classes. Table 1 shows the actual composition of the classrooms, as nearly as possible. The differences between the two groups of students were two. First, the CPC children had more preschool experience than the home-school children because they had been enrolled in the CPCs at ages three or four. Second, the two groups were different in the way they were selected. The home-school kindergartens enrolled any five-year-olds in their district, while the CPCs chose those most in need in terms of educational deprivation and required a parent commitment to the program. As seen in Table 1, the mean number of students per classroom was 25, down from the 1985 figure of 25.7. This number of 25 is equivalent to the nationwide kindergarten class size of 25 (Gardner, 1986). The home-school membership (range 22 to 31), as expected, was higher than the CPC membership (range 18 to 29). The figures in Table 1 are based on observations and teacher interviews made during November/December 1985 and April/May 1986 by staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation. Membership figures from principals' summaries and from Department of Government Funded monitors correspond closely.

Table 1

CHAPTER 2 ADK CLASSES AND MEMBERSHIP DATA 1986

School	Number of Classes CPC	Number of Classes Home-School	Home-School Membership	CPC Membership
Carver/Wheatley	4	3	88	104
Henson/Olive	2	1	22	37
Jensen/Miller	2	1	26	51
King/Dickens*	2	1	27	56
Melody/Cole	2	2	48	46
Webster/Hansberry	2	1	31	44
TOTALS	14	9	242	338
	23		580	

Mean number of students per room CPC 24.2

Home-school 26.3

Total group 25

*The class at Dickens is bilingual and thus has a full time bilingual teacher in addition to the regular classroom teacher.

Five of the six schools having Chapter 2 ADKs serve black neighborhoods. The sixth school, King/Dickens, serves a black population of 63 percent and an Hispanic population of 36 percent. The average poverty index of these schools is 62.1 percent, as compared with the 1986 citywide figure of 42.2 percent. According to the head teachers, the percentages of parents receiving public aid is from 90 to 98 percent, except for Jensen/Miller which as an academy receives its students from a wider area and thus has an estimated 80 percent of parents on welfare. All schools have from two to eight supplementary programs funded by a variety of sources.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Attendance

> Did Chapter 2 ADK improve children's school attendance? How did teacher attendance rates compare with citywide teacher attendance rates?

Table 2 shows the pupil attendance rates for the Chapter 1 ADKs during fiscal 1986 according to principals' summaries. Figures are also given for 1982 (when these kindergartens were half-day), for the second semester of 1983 (when the kindergartens became all-day), for 1984 and 1985, and for kindergartens citywide. For the most part Chapter 2 ADK pupil attendance has remained steady for the four years of the program's operation, with 1986 about the same as 1985. As expected, the CPC rate is higher than the home-school rate, but the latter improved considerably after this program became all-day. Most important, the Chapter 2 CPC attendance rate (94 percent) is higher than the citywide ADK rate (92 percent) and well above the citywide half-day kindergarten rate (90 percent). The overall Chapter 2 ADK rate of 92 percent is the same as the citywide ADK rate. These Chapter 2 rates according to principals' summaries were corroborated closely by classroom observations.

Teacher attendance rates for the Chapter 2 ADK teachers were examined from the teacher attendance file constructed by the Technical Services Bureau of the Department of Research and Evaluation. Although teachers' attendance rate of 95.6 percent was down from fiscal 1985 (96.2 percent), it was higher than the overall attendance rate for all professional staff citywide (94.9 percent) and slightly higher than the 95.4 percent rate of all the teachers in the same schools. The range of days absent for Chapter 2 kindergarten teachers was from 0 to 14.

Instructional Methods and Activities

> What kind of instructional methods and activities were used to instruct students? Were these appropriate for educationally disadvantaged kindergartners and in accord with recent research on early childhood education?

In recent years a growing interest has been evidenced in early childhood education. The reasons for this interest are manifold: changes in society, criticism of schools, increased awareness of the educationally disadvantaged, the necessity for schools to be cost-conscious, an increased emphasis on testing and accountability, a change in psychological views and knowledge about children's development (Brandt, 1986; Chicago Association for the Education of Youth Children, 1984; Doremus, 1986; Elkind, 1986a; Salazer, 1986). New research is appearing about play, dramatization, reading and writing in the early years (Cooper and McNamee, 1984; Mavrogenes, in press; McNamee et al, 1985; Paley, 1984; Pellegrini, 1985; Rubin et al, 1983; Sponseller, 1982). A crucial issue in this increased study is the quality of preschool programs. Due to the reasons just mentioned, the trend over the past 20 years has been toward an academic curriculum--bringing first grade down into kindergarten or to an even earlier age. This academic emphasis has been thought to be the panacea for education--to "get back to the basics," to make up for the deficits

Table 2

CHAPTER 2 ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PUPIL ATTENDANCE

		Attendance Rates (Percents)				
		Half-Day	All-Day			
	School	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
CPCs	Miller	92	95	95	93	94
	Dickens	90	93	89	93	96
	Olive	91	92	88	92	89
	Hansberry	96	94	93	94	93
	Cole	96	96	94	97	98
	Wheatley	93	93	90	95	94
	Averages	94	94	92	94	94
Home-Schools:	Jensen	85	95	93	96	94
	King	87	96	87	90	91
	Henson	85	92	88	88	82
	Webster	84	95	92	92	91
	Sumner/Melody*	88	89	92	94	94
	Carver	87	92	88	89	88
	Averages	86	93	90	91	91
Kindergartens citywide			90	89	90	All-Day 92
						Half-Day 90

*Melody became the home-school of Cole CPC in September 1983.

in early child rearing, to form competent young children able to handle the stresses and demands of modern life (Elkind, 1986a). Subtle pressures for academics might also have been placed on teachers by demands of the curriculum such as long lists of learning outcomes or discrete skills to be mastered.

More recently, however, reactions have appeared against this placing of young children in formal instructional programs appropriate for older children. Current recommendations are for more developmentally appropriate child-centered approaches. For one thing, longitudinal research is beginning to shed light on the nature of quality preschool programs. Studies like those of High/Scope's preschool (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986; Schweinhart, Weikart, and Lerner, 1986) and of the Syracuse early-intervention program (Nienhuis, 1986) have reported that such high-quality early education for disadvantaged children improves their life chances. Children from these programs, compared to matched control groups, were more likely to achieve in school, graduate from high school and become employed and less likely to need special education classes, repeat grade levels, commit crimes, have children as teen-agers, or receive welfare assistance. The total benefits to taxpayers for sending children to these classes has been estimated as "about $28,000 per participant" (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986, p.8). The common denominator of such programs is that they are of "high quality," meaning that they establish an environment that supports children's active learning (Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986). Formal instruction emphasizing academic skills was not the primary thrust of such programs.

A second force reacting to this early academic emphasis has consisted of child development professionals who specialize in early childhood education. David Elkind (1986 a&b), president of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), & Samuel Sava (Gardner, 1986), executive director of the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), are both warning about the subject-centered approach of formal instruction at the kindergarten level. Such an approach, at variance with the natural mode of young children's learning, produces stress, a sense of guilt about self-initiated activities, little opportunity for reflective abstraction, and dependence on others for a sense of self-worth (Elkind, 1986a). Numerous other professional groups have also spoken out. The International Reading Association, National Council of Teachers of English, Association for Childhood Education International, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, as well as the NAEYC and NAESP, have issued a position paper on pre-first grade literacy development (International Reading Association, 1986). This statement expresses their concern about "rigid, formal pre-reading programs with inappropriate expectations and experiences for [young children's] levels of development." Such programs do not allow children to become risk-takers, focus too much attention on isolated skill development, place too little attention on reading and writing for pleasure, and are often based on political and economic considerations rather than on knowledge of how young children learn. The Chicago Association for the Education of Young Children has issued a similar position paper (1984). Individual early childhood and literacy educators are also voicing the same kinds of concerns with increasing urgency (Day and Drake, 1986; Doremus 1986; Salzer, 1986; Soderman and Phillips, 1986).

What is recommended by all these specialists in early childhood education is more of a "child-centered approach--encouraging children to explore in a failure-free environment and basing instruction on the youngster's spontaneous

interests and motivational levels, rather than imposing adult learning priorities on them" (Gardner, 1986, p. vii). Such an approach provides children with opportunities to practice developmental tasks, allows teachers to participate more with children and to be less directive, offers concrete experiences for the learning of academics, and encourages children to become independent learners as a result of hands-on learning experiences. In such classrooms children learn social skills, develop a conscience, listen to stories, dictate experience stories, engage in contracts to plan their learning center activities, freely explore writing in the sense of composition, have a wide choice of play equipment, and stretch out on rugs to enjoy books. They learn math skills while cooking or measuring actual objects, build with blocks, pretend play in a housekeeping corner, talk with other children and adults, go on field trips and afterwards read, write, and talk about them (Day and Drake, 1986; International Reading Association, 1986; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1986). This kind of orientation is actually not new, although it is currently much discussed. The Plowden Report (1966) and researchers such as Barton and Wilder (1964) were saying such things 20 years ago: "The kinds of activities which could help children from lower-class homes develop reading readiness--going places, getting to talk about experiences with a responsive adult, getting acquainted with symbols, being read to, developing a love for imaginative stories--are not being provided sufficiently in the classroom" (Barton and Wilder, 1964, p. 387).

Still other reports are suggesting and offering material for a compromise of sorts between the academic and developmental points of view. One review of current research on ADK, after noting a "distinct trend" over the last decade from the developmental to the structured/cognitive program model, points out that the latter kinds of program "show a greater consistency in obtaining measurable effects" (Puleo, 1986, pp. 32-33). Rosenshine (1986) explains this finding more specifically: research has found direct, explicit, systematic, step-by-step instruction applicable to well-structured disciplines such as mathematics and reading decoding but less relevant for more loosely structured areas like composition and reading comprehension. This kind of explicit instruction often involves an endless number of worksheets for guided practice, independent practice, review, and homework, as in Chicago's previously used Mastery Learning Programs in reading and math.

Staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation observed the Chapter 2 ADKs twice, in November 1985 and again in April/May 1986. These observations were made at all times of the day and on all days of the week. Each classroom was observed for approximately 45 minutes. Thus the total time of the observations was about 35 hours. In addition, in June 1986 teachers were asked on their questionnaires about their instructional methods and activities. From these two sources a clear description of the program in practice can be compiled. On the one hand, exemplary methods and activities were in evidence. The median number of field trips (four) was up over 1985 (three), and teachers reported making good use of these trips in the curriculum. They prepared children for the trips by reading books, viewing movies and pictures, preparing bulletin boards. After the trips, children painted, composed experience stories, labeled pictures, and even made applesauce from apples picked at a farm. Some teachers made good use of classroom time by combining several activities simultaneously -- children counting to 100 while scissors and paste were being distributed or the teacher spelling out names for children to go get their coats. One school was found to be using team teaching with one ADK teacher responsible for social studies two times a week and another for science.

At the same time, when this Chapter 2 ADK program is compared to the kind of developmentally oriented programs currently being recommended, a difference is seen. For instance, Barbara Day, former president of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and chair of Teaching and Learning, University of North Carolina, describes the developmental but "very structured" program she has seen to be most effective: one third of the activities are teacher-directed in small or large groups; one third are assigned by the teacher and worked on by the children independently or with a small group of other children; and one third are children's own choices (Brandt, 1986). When Chapter 2 ADK activities are analyzed in these terms, the percentages are 61 for teacher-directed activities, 35 for independent activities, and only 4 for free choice activities. These classes would seem to be failing children by not giving them independence in directing some of their own learning.

Furthermore, when the observed activities were broken into two groups--worksheet or workbook pages vs. activities not involving pencils and paper -- the former comprised 48 percent of the total number of activities and the latter 52 percent. During two observations of 45 minutes each, the entire time was spent by the children doing nothing but worksheets. Early childhood educators, however, are consistently pointing out the inappropriateness of too many paper and pencil activities for five-year-olds, who learn through direct concrete encounters with their world rather than through formal education involving symbolic rules (Day and Drake, 1988; Doremus, 1986; Elkind, 1986a; International Reading Association, 1986; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1986; Salzar, 1986; Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986 a & b). "While 80 to 90 percent of all children continue to be hyperopic, or farsighted, until age 6, children much younger than that are required to spend most of their time doing activities that require near point containment and mature binocular coordination." They are often unable to make the rapid eye fixations, releases and refixations required while adjusting from a blackboard or the teacher to their worksheets (Soderman and Phillips, 1986, p. 71).

When teachers were asked how they incorporate free play into their day, about 2/3 of them answered that they only allow it after lunch or breakfast or after a child's work is finished. Thus some children would never be involved in free play or free choice. Only four percent of observed activities were free choice for the children: three times they were allowed to choose puzzles or manipulatives after lunch or after their work was completed and once they were allowed free choice within interest centers. Most Chapter 2 ADK teachers would seem to agree with the teacher who wrote in a parents' newsletter, "The children are working hard to cover all the work that is required in kindergarten. We do have fun, but the purpose of kindergarten is to acquire skills that will lead to success in reading and math." Yet play has been found to help children's cognitive, affective, linguistic, and social growth (Chicago Association for the Education of Young Children, 1984; Dobbert, 1985; Pellegrini, 1985; Sponseller, 1982). Children from low income families engage in much less make-believe play than children from higher income families and thus need this type of activity in school more than ever (Christie, 1983; Sponseller, 1982).

Interest centers are another recommendation for child-centered activities. "The classroom needs to be organized with experiential learning centers that allow for differences in learning styles, that encourage children to explore a variety of materials and make decisions" (Brandt, 1986, p. 30). Some teachers were observed clearly planning along these lines. A science table, for instance, contained peacock feathers, rocks, bottles of different smells,

magnets, clocks, and an abacus. However, in these classrooms interest centers were only observed in use one time, and in 16 of the rooms there was no evidence that they even existed. When asked about her interest centers, one teacher explained that "reading and math take up most of the time. Kids don't learn when running around the room."

Reading and writing are the core of a school curriculum. The kinds of activities considered appropriate for five-year-olds as they "emerge" into literacy are writing freely in whatever way they are able; reading books to themselves however they can; reading and writing real-life print such as labels and letters; dictating stories and other language experience activities; participating in dramatic play and in "rug" or sharing times in order to improve oral language skills; and, especially, having storybooks and poems read and reread to them, "the single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success in reading" (Anderson, et al., 1985, p. 23; Chicago Association for the Education of Young Children, 1986; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1986; U.S. Department of Education, 1986). Furthermore, the most recent research on reading styles is sending out a message strong and clear: "'what works', is not always phonics. In fact, what works best in teaching young children to read may seldom be intensive phonics instruction" (Carbo, 1987, p. 432).

In these classes reading and writing are recognized as basic subjects, reading activities comprising 50 percent of all activities observed and writing 23 percent. Of the reading activities, paper and pencils were involved in half the activities; 70 percent of the activities had to do with decoding and the alphabet. Reading stories to the class comprised 15 percent of the reading activities, and holistic activities focusing on comprehension 23 percent. Approximately 31 percent of all reading activities could be classified as motivational, designed to communicate the idea that reading can be fun. Most reading activities consisted of drill, even extending in two cases to instruction in formal grammar. As for observed writing instruction, 80 percent of this was copying or tracing of names, letters, or numbers, with copying the "Morning Story" observed three times. This latter activity is called by researchers "a curious phenomenon" which does not teach young children "the orchestration of processes necessary to engage in conventional writing" (Dyson, 1985, pp. 497, 509). In only three cases was meaning involved in the writing instruction: children filling in blanks in sentences with words from the board, writing a different ending to a story on an experience chart, and writing about rain after a discussion of the weather. Children were observed talking 21 percent of the time, but all of this oral expression was recitation, drill or simple answers to factual questions, except in two instances when children were 1) telling stories to the class and 2) talking about rain.

Another important variable in school learning is the amount of time students are actually engaged in learning tasks (Wyne and Stuck, 1982). One estimation is that 10 to 50 percent of time for instruction is lost in elementary classrooms (Strother, 1984). In our observation of these Chapter 2 ADK classes, faster children--those who finished their work first--were given nothing to do 42 percent of the time. In some instances they were provided with extra worksheets or told to get puzzles and manipulatives when their "work" was finished. In the worst cases they were told to sit up straight, fold their hands, and don't go ahead to the next page, or they became noisy as they got bored and the teacher began screaming at them and handing out more worksheets. In only three cases were appropriate activities provided for these faster pupils: twice they were sent to interest centers and once they were involved in peer tutoring with slower students.

Achievement Outcomes

Did pupils show progress in the areas of reading readiness and number concepts?

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), Level 5: Early Primary Battery, standardized untimed power tests given orally, were administered to Chapter 2 ADK students in October 1985 as a pretest and again in May 1986 as a posttest. This level consists of five subtests: listening, vocabulary, word analysis, language, and mathematics. Table 3 presents the 1986 results on these subtests for the total Chapter 2 group and for both the CPC and the home-school subgroups. In addition, for comparison purposes Chapter 2 gain scores are given for 1984 and 1985 and also the 1986 scores for all other CPCs besides Chapter 2.

From the results set forth in Table 3 we can see that the 1986 Chapter 2 kindergartners, even the CPC children, arrived at kindergarten below norms (K.2) in all areas except word analysis. By the posttest they all were at (K.8) or above norms in word analysis and math and the CPC children were at norms in listening. These gains on all subtests were highly significant for both groups of children. In six months of instruction they gained from six to eight months growth, except for language, where the growth was less, as it has been in all years. The home-school children especially remained low in language, six months below norms in May and only having shown four months growth in six months of instruction. As expected, the CPC children were ahead of the home-school children on both the pre and posttest although the latter gained more in both vocabulary and word analysis, perhaps because they had farther to go. In fact, gain score differences between groups on all subtests were not statistically significant. The Chapter 2 CPC group evidenced growth very similar to the other CPCs, performing somewhat better than they in word analysis and language and somewhat worse in vocabulary and listening.

Parent Involvement

How many parents volunteered time in their children's classrooms or in the parent rooms? Did their participation help their children?

Several sources offer information on the parent component of the Chapter 2 ADK program: questionnaires sent to the parents and parent resource teachers in June 1986, classroom teacher questionnaires, parent rosters sent out in October by the Department of Research and Evaluation in an effort to keep track of classroom participation, interviews of teachers and head teachers, and the observations. During the fall observations a total of 11 parents were observed in the classrooms and a median number of 12 in the parent rooms. In 1985 only six parents were observed in the classrooms but a median number of 13 in the parent rooms. In the spring fewer parents were observed, perhaps corroborating a teacher's remark that parent participation started out well but then dropped. Teachers reported a median number of eight parents who helped regularly in the classrooms. When the head teachers and parent resource teachers were asked to estimate the percentages of parent participation, the figures ran from 30 to 100 percent for CPC parents and from 10 to 85 percent for home-school parents. Parent rosters were observed in the classrooms 81 percent of the time; these always had parent signatures on them but sometimes the period covered was as long as one month. Several teachers, however, frankly admitted that they don't like parents in their classrooms.

Table 3

RESULTS ON THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, LEVEL 5

Subtest and Group	Number (matched scores 1986)	Grade Equivalents October 1985 Median	May 1986 Median	Median Gains 1986	1985	1984
Vocabulary						
Total Ch. 2 group	475	P.7	K.5	0.6	0.6	0.6
Ch. 2 CPCs	303	P.7	K.5	0.6	0.6	0.6
Ch. 2 home-school kind.	172	P.6	K.3	0.7	0.6	0.5
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	587	P.8	K.7	0.7	0.7	
Word Analysis						
Total Ch. 2 group	475	K.3	1.2	0.7	0.7	0.9
Ch. 2 CPCs	303	K.5	1.2	0.7	0.8	0.9
Ch. 2 home-school kind.	172	K.2	K.9	0.8	0.7	0.9
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	587	K.4	1.0	0.6	0.6	
Language						
Total Ch. 2 group	475	P.8	K.3	0.5	0.5	0.7
Ch. 2 CPCs	303	P.9	K.6	0.5	0.5	0.8
Ch. 2 home-school kind.	172	P.7	K.2	0.4	0.6	0.7
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	587	P.8	K.3	0.5	0.5	
Math						
Total Ch. 2 group	475	P.9	K.8	0.7	0.8	0.8
Ch. 2 CPCs	303	K.0	K.8	0.7	0.8	1.0
Ch. 2 home-school kind.	172	P.7	K.7	0.7	0.8	0.7
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	587	P.9	K.8	0.7	0.7	
Listening						
Total Ch. 2 group	475	P.8	K.7	0.7	0.7	
Ch. 2 CPCs	303	P.9	K.8	0.7	0.9	
Ch. 2 home-school kind.	172	P.7	K.6	0.7	0.7	
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	587	P.9	K.8	0.8	0.7	

P = preschool, K = kindergarten

One favorable sign in regard to parent participation is evident from parent answers to a set of seven questions on their questionnaires about their involvement in the parent rooms and classrooms, their communication with the teachers, and their help with homework. All answers to these questions indicated increased participation from 1985 to 1986, except for a few cases which remained stable. For instance, the percent of home-school parents saying they volunteered in their children's classrooms rose from 19 to 52 percent and the percent saying that teachers suggested ways to help their children at home rose from 55 to 75 percent. In general, the CPC parents indicated more involvement with the schools than home-school parents. The difference between the groups was statistically significant ($p<.05$), in favor of CPC parents, for positive answers about participating in parent room activities, volunteering in the classroom, attending parent meetings, and teachers suggesting ways to help their children. The teachers also indicated that they were more frequently suggesting activities for parents to do at home with their children. However, some areas were still not suggested often enough: cooking with children (not suggested by 50 percent of teachers), letting children explore writing with paper and pencil in whatever way they are able (50 percent), getting children a library card (29 percent), and providing children with art and writing supplies (33 percent).

The schools make massive efforts to communicate with and involve parents. They are invited to meetings and school programs, special workshops on a variety of appealing and important topics are held for them, GED and college classes are set up for them, trips and special events are planned for them and their children, prizes and refreshments are offered to them. In the area of reading, for instance, at least four kinds of special projects have been devised: 1) trips to the neighborhood library for parents to get library cards, 2) lending libraries at schools with worksheets on books for parents to use at home with their children, 3) school book fairs, and 4) reading groups for parents to become familiar with award winning books with prizes of the books themselves for good attendance. The schools even use pressure to gain parent participation. CPCs require one-half of one day a week or the children will be dropped. Several schools have similar requirements for home-school parents, although these requirements are not so easily enforced. However, for non-participation of home-school parents one school limits the number of graduation tickets available and another says their children can only attend school for half a day.

Parents generally agree that they have good communication with the schools, although 10 percent say their communication is only "fair" or "poor." When asked how this situation might be improved, their most frequent answer was for teachers to be more willing to work with parents. In this connection, 12 percent of CPC parents and 25 percent of home-school parents said that teachers had never or only once or twice suggested ways they could help their children at home. One problem related to home-school parents is that two schools have not yet determined who is responsible for their involvement. At three schools this is clearly part of the parent resource teacher's responsibility. At the sixth school the responsibility lies with the CPCX parent resource teacher.

The most usual parent duties in the classroom were accompanying field trips, tutoring individual or several students, and performing clerical tasks such as getting worksheets ready. In the parent room they most often cooked or sewed, made activities for their children to use either at home or school, and learned how to work with and help their children. Parents also indicated

the kinds of things they did with their children at home. Areas that were not done by 40 percent or more parents were making and playing reading and math games, cooking with their children, and taking their children to the library. Seventy-eight percent of the parents said that they rarely go to the library to check out books for their children. One parent even wrote, "My child can't read so there is no need to go to the library." Only 15 percent of the parents said they read to their children every day. Because research since the 1960s has made clear the importance of family milieu in optimizing children's growth and educational environment, schools' contacts with parents are crucial (Bastian et al, 1987; Honig, 1982). Furthermore, training them to be present in classrooms and to improve their parenting skills is also crucial. Without such training parental participation in schools may not make any educational difference for children (Honig, 1982). As one teacher said, "Parents take monitoring, but it's worth it."

For the third year in a row statistical analysis of parent questionnaire responses and of their children's gains scores on the ITBS underscores the positive effect of parental involvement in the classroom. In all years statistically significant differences ($p<.05$ or .01) have appeared between the gain scores of children whose parents said they were active in the classroom and those whose parents said they were inactive. In 1984 this difference was three-four months more gain for CPC children of active parents in vocabulary and language (Chicago Public Schools, 1985). In 1985 the difference was four months more gain for home-school children of active parents in language and word analysis (Chicago Public Schools, 1986). In 1986 the difference was three months more gain for both groups of children of active parents in listening and for the home-school children of active parents in vocabulary. This latter result in vocabulary only approaches statistical significance ($p<.09$) probably due to the smaller than usual number of parent responses (20 to 23) because of problems in the mailing of their questionnaires. The trend, however, seems clear: if parents participate regularly in their children's classrooms, these children will grow in linguistic areas three-four more months than children of parents who did not participate regularly, at least as measured by the ITBS.

A further investigation revealed in a different way the importance of parents being involved in their children's schools. In this case parents' answers to the seven questions about their involvement in parent rooms and classrooms, their communication with teachers, and their help with homework were divided into two groups, less often and more often. Significant gain score differences (four months) in favor of children whose parents were more often involved were found on the listening subtest.

Several additional analyses of specific questions on the parent questionnaire revealed further interesting results. One question asked parents how often they went to their neighborhood library to check out books for their children. The parent answers were broken into two groups--those who said they went often (at least one time a month) and those who said they did not go often (less than one time a month or not at all). Their children's gain scores on the ITBS were then compared for the two groups. Children of those who went often to the library made mean gains on the language subtest three months higher than those who did not go often. Furthermore, parents' answers to whether they read to their children were divided into two groups--

less often (never or occasionally) and more often (once or twice a week or every day). On the language subtest, home-school children whose parents read to them more often gained eight months as compared to four months for home-school children whose parents read to them less often, a signifcant difference ($p<.05$).

Another question asked parents to check any of 17 activities they did at home for or with their children. Children's ITBS gain scores were then compared, item by item, for children whose parents said they did that activity and children whose parents said they did not do the activity. The strongest gain differences appeared on both the language and listening subtests for taking the child to the library. These differences involved three to five months more growth for children whose parents did take them to the library, and were highly significant ($p<.007$) on both subtests. Other activities which seemed to make a difference, but not so strongly ($p<.03$, 05, or .06), were reading to children (on the language and listening subtests), playing reading and math games (for CPC children on the word analysis subtest), and both helping with handwriting and providing children with writing supplies (on the vocabulary subtest). In all these cases children of parents who said they did these activities scored three to six months higher on the ITBS than children whose parents did not check the activities.

Affective Growth

Did pupils show evidence of affective growth?

An important goal of the Chapter 2 ADK, according to the program's proposal, is to "strengthen the affective domain." To document efforts in this direction, teachers were asked on the questionnaire sent to them in June 1986 how they provided for affective growth in their classes. To some extent, their answers revealed their philosophical orientation toward early childhood education. For instance, a teacher in the academic-skills tradition answered that she fostered affective growth by evaluation, counteracting weaknesses and building on strengths, homework to reinforce skills, and discussions of attendance and responsibility. Another teacher oriented toward developmental activities mentioned conversation for vocabulary development, hands-on experience for discussion, individualized work, and filmstrips and slides for introducing new concepts. Most teachers (64 percent) answered this question by mentioning the discussion and sharing of feelings--why people become angry, frightened, or sad and how to handle such feelings. Other answers were encouragement and praise, mirror work, games, children helping in the classroom, and rewards. These answers reveal an awareness by teachers of the need for attention to the affective domain.

In an effort to measure affective growth, the Department of Research and Evaluation developed the Affective Rating Scale. This scale consists of 30 items related to children's interest in school, feelings about school activities, emotional stability, social and verbal skills, and skills necessary in first grade. Classroom teachers filled out this instrument for each child in October 1985, as a pretest, and again in June 1986, as a posttest. They were to circle numbers ranging from 1, never, to 7, always. Matched results were available for 449 children.

An analysis of the ratings on these scales showed that the total mean gain for all children, pre to posttest, was highly significant, a mean difference of 12.4 points. Gains on all subscales (interest in school, social skills, emotional stability, verbal skills) were also highly significant, with verbal skills having the highest mean gain. When the ratings of the CPC children were compared to the ratings of the home-school children, the former were seen to be significantly higher on the pretest than the latter, as would be expected. On the posttest, however, there was no significant difference between groups. Both groups of children made approximately the same gains, although the gains of the CPC children were significantly lower on nine items. The highest gains for all children were on items related to skills necessary for first grade: helping others, working independently, cleaning up, showing responsibility and self-confidence, asking questions and volunteering answers. Such a result either means that teachers value these skills most highly or that the program is successful in developing them. When the ratings were examined by gender, females were seen as rated significantly higher on both the pre and the posttest although there was little difference in gains by gender. These findings might confirm the fact that females are often more verbal than males at an earlier age and also the national concern that teachers are not willing or able to tolerate the aggressiveness of young males and thus tend to rate them lower (Paley, 1984; Soderman and Phillips, 1986). In general, the findings from the Affective Rating Scale would seem to indicate that these Chapter 2 ADK children did grow in affective areas, at least as rated by their teachers.

An effort was made to see if children who gained in affective areas also gained in cognitive areas. Although the correlations were weak between gains on the Affective Rating Scale and the ITBS (.21 or lower), 13 percent of these correlations were significant ($p<.05$ or better), and of these, 90 percent appeared on the word analysis subtest. These figures indicate a positive but weak relationship. When posttest Affective Rating Scale and ITBS scores were correlated for individual children, the correlations were somewhat higher (.20 to .30), more often significant (15 percent) and still predominantly in word analysis (61 percent), although 35 percent of the significant correlations appeared on the language subtest. These results might indicate either that children who score better on tests are preferred by teachers or that there is only a minor relationship between affective and cognitive growth, at least as analyzed in this study.

Perceptions of Participants

> How did those concerned with this program view their participation?

All the Chapter 2 ADK teachers who returned their questionnaires (N=14) mentioned the advantages of having more time: for individualization, enrichment, widening of experience, intensity of teaching, and covering of material. The weaknesses of the program that they mentioned all had to do with the pressures put on the children. Some pressures specifically mentioned were academic: children sitting too long with not enough free time, and first grade skills being pushed down into kindergarten. Other pressures had to do with the lunch period--not enough time for release of energy or even to finish eating. Another kind of pressure was the lack of time for a daily rest

period. These kinds of pressures, as mentioned earlier, can result in children being alienated from school and from themselves (Elkind, 1986a). The parent resource teachers on their questionnaires (N=4) also mentioned some problems in connection with their job. Two noted impaired communication with their head teachers and principals. Their most frequent suggestion for program improvement was stricter guidelines and requirements for parent participation, since, as one teacher pointed out, parents are coming in younger and more passive all the time.

The 15 teacher aides who returned their questionnaires all made only positive comments about the program, mentioning how well they work with the teachers and how close their partnerships are. Several teachers, however, shared specific complaints about the aides: one aide had to be reminded of what is expected, one's effort was satisfactory but not her skill, one did not enjoy working with small children. The teachers' suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the teacher-aide team included the chance to change aides early in the year, the provision of more planning time with the aide, and making sure that the aides are suited to and qualified for the job.

Parents' answers on their questionnaires showed a positive response to this program. Of 193 parents who filled out page 1 of their questionnaire, 94 percent said that their children had enjoyed school this year, 93 percent were pleased with the teachers' attitudes toward their children, and 88 percent said that their children had learned to get along with other children. Their open-ended comments were all positive. They appreciated the interest and concern of the staff, they were pleased with what their children had learned, and they were excited about how they themselves had learned so much--from how and why to read their children books to solving family problems. In the words of one mother, "I learned a lot that I thought I knew." When they were asked more specifically what they had learned about child development, their answers revealed a great deal. They said they learned how to teach some skills--numbers, colors, and reading through games. They also became aware of the kind of skills necessary for school and life: independence, perseverance, self-confidence, patience, and respect for others. They learned the importance of speaking more softly to their children, praising them, realizing that they are smart and are learning a lot at such a young age. They said they now know that their children need a lot of help at home, that they must read to them, talk to them, and answer their questions. As one mother wrote, "I learned that I have to treat my child different than others treat theirs."

INPLEMENTATION

The implementation of this Chapter 2 ADK program proceeded smoothly in FY 1986 for the most part. Qualified teachers were in place in all classrooms. According to their questionnaires, their median years of kindergarten teaching experience were 5 (range 1.5 to 12) and median years of teaching 12.5 (range 2 to 25). Half of them had a bachelor's degree and half a master's. Eighty-six percent held a kindergarten/primary certificate, with two FTBs, and the rest certified in intermediate/upper, special education, or library science. The CPC teachers were more experienced than the home-school teachers and were more apt to possess kindergarten/primary certification. The four parent resource teachers who returned their questionnaires all had bachelor degrees in home economics. Three of them had taken additional work in early childhood education. One of them held an early childhood endorsement; they were certified in homemaking arts, secondary grades, and kindergarten/primary. They had worked with parents from 3 to 18 years, and in early childhood or kindergarten/primary from 1 to 10 years.

During the year two classrooms experienced delays in having aides assigned to them. In Hansberry 104 there was no aide until mid-October, and in Melody 110, an extra classroom which began in November, an aide was not provided until March. The 15 aides who returned their questionnaires indicated that 53 percent of them had some college training, with at least one having completed a bachelor's degree. Twenty-seven percent had had experience working with children as classroom volunteers or community youth workers. One aide was a former CPC parent who had gotten her GED certificate and was then going to college.

Supplies have been no major problem. The majority of teachers and head teachers (66 percent) were satisfied with their availability. A few mentioned occasional shortages of crayons, paper, manipulatives, math supplements, and small appliances and materials in the parent rooms. Space, however, a much more difficult problem to solve, was frequently mentioned as a need: larger classrooms, bathrooms in the rooms, more storage space, and a parent room at Carver Primary.

Inservices were held frequently for these teachers. At each site teachers and head teachers met regularly, and outside speakers (such as publishing representatives) came in for special occasions. The Bureau of Early Childhood provided inservice on interest centers, teaching writing, and language development. A staff member of the Department of Research and Evaluation presented sessions on how to teach kindergartners to write (compose). When asked what inservices they liked best, the teachers mentioned those on language development and writing. Some suggestions they had on future inservices included ideas for learning centers, new research in early childhood education, play in kindergarten, art, science, and social studies. Aides want practical suggestions and materials to use in class.

An interesting development in connection with this Chapter 2 ADK program is that several schools have been able to attract ouside support. At Hansberry benefactors from industry paid to take the children to camp in the summer, and a grant from the Institute of Psychoanalysis provided a special series of inservices on student behavior, discipline, and the myths of teaching. Computers were donated to Wheatley for special help in math and reading. Such support might be a profitable way for other schools to receive aid for their needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Chapter 2 ADK program is bascially sound. It fits in with current research that shows that 1) ADK can produce significantly greater gains than half-day kindergarten, 2) basic skill gains are enduring, and 3) pupils of lower socio-economic backgrounds appear to particularly benefit from ADK (Puleo, 1986). There is evidence that early childhood programs, especially for disadvantaged children, can reduce the need for later placement in special education and reduce the number of children retained for more than one year in a grade. The economic savings to a school district have been estimated as outweighing the costs by seven times (Scarr and Weinberg, 1986). However, in all the reports the quality of the program is always mentioned as making the significant difference (Bronfenbrenner, 1975; Lazar et al., 1982; Puleo, 1986; Schweinhart and Weikart, 1986; Scarr and Weinberg, 1986). Therefore, in an effort to improve the quality of this program (and indeed of all kindergartens) and fit it more to the model suggested by current research, the following recommendations must be made:

1) Chapter 2 ADK teachers are effectively presenting math and reading decoding to their students, using a structured approach suited to these subjects. Test scores reflect their success. However, less well-structured areas, such as reading comprehension, oral expression, creativity, and writing composition, are being neglected. These areas require more developmentally appropriate activities than drill, isolated skill development, and ditto sheets. In order to promote child-centered active learning, taking advantage of children's natural interests, encouraging independence, and allowing for differences in learning styles, these kinds of hands-on experiences should be provided much more frequently than they are:

   a) Dramatic and free play in areas set up in the room such as housekeeping, doctor's office, post office, grocery store, with costumes or hats available;

   b) Dramatization of favorite stories and nursery rhymes read to the class and of stories dictated by the children themselves;

   c) Interest centers with their contents changed every other week and used as an integral part of instruction, not only as places to go when work is finished. If teachers need a perpetual wealth of ideas for these centers, they should join professional organizations such as the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English and read their journals, The Reading Teacher and Language Arts.

2) Activities should be included in reading instruction which show children that reading is fun and what books are. It is absolutely essential that teachers read to their classes every day. Teachers should work with librarians to choose appropriate books and practice reading any book before using it in class to promote the dramatic qualities of the stories and to provide enrichment activities before and after the reading. A focus on nursery rhymes from the beginning would not only be pleasurable for children but would also work on the learning outcome of "identifying rhyming words." Children should be allowed to take books home from

schools. Book corners with rugs and pillows should be set up in rooms to encourage children to browse through books on their own. Such sessions can work in kindergarten if a) the time is kept short (5-10 minutes), b) the sessions are held regularly at the same time each day, c) all books that have been read aloud are easily accessible to students, d) students can look at books in pairs and talk quietly while doing so, e) teachers read along with the children, and f) a wide variety of books is made available, including wordless picture books and preprimers (Kaisen, 1987). Finally, teachers should take advantage of what professional librarians can offer. Neighborhood libraries hold story hours, show films, set up book clubs, and offer special activities with books. One Chapter 2 CPC held a very successful library card drive in which 90-95 percent of kindergarten parents and children got cards.

3) Writing instruction should not consist only of handwriting and copying. Children must be supplied with pencils or pens and paper and told to write anything they want in whatever way they are able. The only rules are that a) they must first think before they write, b) they must read their writing to someone when they finish (teacher, aide, parent, class) and, c) nothing is said about spelling, mechanics, or appearance (except praise). Such an activity is pleasurable, promotes fluency, encourages risk-taking in a failure-free environment, and shows children that writing is communciation in which thoughts are translated into symbols which mean something to other people. Language experience activities (children dictating stories to the teacher) also show the relationship between reading and writing. Such writing can be "published" as home-made books for children to share during their free reading period. The kinds of literacy experiences suggested here should help prevent the "subtle danger" of Americans' increasing inability to deal with more complex literary tasks such as solving problems, critical thinking, summarizing, and writing letters (Venezky, et al., 1987). They also naturally involve such learning outcomes as "following oral directions," "recognizing initial consonant sounds in words," "associating meaning with the printed word," and "identifying main ideas."

4) Oral expression should be promoted more than it is. According to teachers on their questionnaires, only 50 percent of them have Show and Tell, and 14 percent say they do not allow talk during free play or promote discussion of more than single words. Quiet classrooms are by no means necessarily the most effective classrooms.

5) All teachers must be shown the advantages of working with parents and must incorporate into their plans ways of preparing and helping them. All schools should also assign specific responsibility for involving all parents, especially those of home-school kindergartners. National and local results have shown too clearly the advantages of such involvement for any teacher or any school to neglect it. For disadvantaged families the pressures of economic survival and family maintenance are so consuming and they are often so intimidated by the distances between themselves and school professionals that the job of involving them in their children's schools is very difficult, but it must be done well and completely (Bastian et al, 1987). Principals, head teachers, parent resource teachers, and classroom teachers must work together on this important goal.

6) All teachers, including classroom teachers as well as head teachers, parent resource teachers and principals, must teach parents how to help their children at home. Activities that according to our analyses seem especially valuable are reading to children every day, taking children to the library to get library cards and check out books, providing children with writing supplies and letting them write however they are able, and cooking with children. These kinds of activities make a difference in children's school performance and ultimately in their lives.

7) All teachers working in this program (and in all kindergartens) might be required to have an early childhood endorsement together with their kindergarten/primary certificate. This ought to assure that the teachers are aware of developmentally appropriate activities for five-year-olds. As one large scale preschool study found, the only teacher characteristic that predicted program effectiveness was the amount of early childhood training (Ruopp et al., 1979). Kindergarten is different from preschool but it also should be different from first grade. Early childhood endorsement together with the kindergarten/primary certificate should provide for the recognition of these differences.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R.C., et al. Becoming A Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading. Champaign, IL: Center for the Study of Reading, 1985.

Barton, A.H. and D.E. Wilder. "Research and Practice in the Teaching of Reading: A Progress Report" in M.B. Miles, ed. Innovation in Education. NY: Teachers College, 1964.

Bastian, Ann, et al. "Rethinking the Agenda for Democratic Schooling." Education Week 6, February 4, 1987, 22, 28.

Brandt, R.S. "On Early Education: A Conversation with Barbara Day." Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 28-30.

Bronfenbrenner, U. "Is Early Intervention Effective?" in U. Bronfenbrenner and M.A. Maloney, eds. Influences on Human Development. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press, 1975.

Carbo, Marie. "Reading Styles Research: "'What Works' Isn't Always Phonics." Phi Delta Kappan 68, February 1987, 431-441.

Chicago Association for the Education of Young Children (CAEYC). Kindergarten: What Should Be. Chicago: CAEYC, 1984.

Chicago Public Schools Department of Research and Evaluation. Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program Final Evaluation Report Fiscal 1984 and 1985. Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1985 and 1986.

Christie, J.F. "The Effects of Play Tutoring on Young Children's Cognitive Performance." Journal of Educational Research 76, July/August 1983, 326-330.

Cooper, Patsy and G.D. McNamee. Erickson Institute's Early Literacy Project. Chicago: Erikson Institute, 1984.

Day, Barbara and K.N. Drake. "Developmental and Experiential Programs: The Key to Quality Education and Care of Young Children." Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 25-27.

Dobbert, M.L. "Play Is Not Monkey Business." Educational Horizons 63, Summer 1985, 158-163.

Doremus, V.P. "Forcing Works for Flowers, But Not for Children." Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 32-35.

Dyson, A.H. "Three Emergent Writers and the School Curriculum: Copying and Other Myths." The Elementary School Journal 85, March 1985, 497-512.

Elkind, David. "Formal Education and Early Childhood Education: An Essential Difference." Phi Delta Kappan 67, May 1986, 631-636. (a)

Elkind, David. "Helping Parents Make Healthy Educational Choices for Their Children." Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 36-38. (b)

Gardner, R.C. Kindergarten Programs and Practices in Public Schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1986.

Honig, A.S. "Parent Involvement in Early Childhood Education" in Bernard Spodek, ed. Handbook of Research in Early Childhood Education. NY: Free Press, 1982.

International Reading Association. "Literacy Development and Pre-First Grade." Young Children 41, May 1986, 10-13. Also in Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 75-76.

Kaisen, Jim. "SSR/Booktime: Kindergarten and 1st Grade Sustained Silent Reading." The Reading Teacher 40, February 1987, 532-536.

Lazar, I., et al. "Lasting Effects of Early Education." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, No. 194, 1982.

Mavrogenes, N.A. "Young Children Composing Then and Now: Recent Research on Emergent Literacy." Visible Language, in press.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Good Teaching Practices for 4- and 5-Year Olds. Washington, D.C: NAEYC, 1986.

McNamee, G.D., et al. "Cognition and Affect in Early Literacy Development." Early Child Development and Care 20, 1985, 229-244.

Nienhuis, Marleen. "Early-Intervention Plan's Effects Mixed." Education Week, December 3, 1986, 9.

Paley, V.G. Boys and Girls: Superheroes in the Doll Corner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Pellegrini, A.D. "The Relations Between Symbolic Play and Literate Behavior: A Review and Critique of the Empirical Literature." Review of Educational Research 55, Spring 1985, 107-121.

Plowden, Bridget, et al. Children and Their Primary Schools: A Report on the Central Advisory Council for Education. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1966.

Puleo, V.T. "Current Research Perspectives on Full-Day Kindergarten." ERS Spectrum 4, Fall 1986, 32-37.

Rosenshine, B.V. "Synthesis of Research on Explicit Teaching." Educational Leadership 43, April 1986, 60-69.

Rubin, K.H., et al. "Play" in E. Hetherington, ed. Handbook of Child Psychology: Socialization, Personality and Social Development. NY: Wiley, 1983.

Ruopp, Richard et al. Children at the Center: Summary Findings and Their Implications (Final Report of the National Day Care Study, vol. 1). Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1979.

Salzer, Richard. "Why Not Assume They're All Gifted Rather Than Handicapped?" Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 74-77.

Scarr, Sandra and R.A. Weinberg. "The Early Childhood Enterprise: Care and Education of the Young." American Psychologist 41, October 1986, 1140-1146.

Schweinhart, L.J. and D.P. Weikart. "Early Childhood Development Programs: A Public Investment Opportunity." Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 4-12.

Schweinhart, L.J., et al. "Consequences of Three Preschool Curriculum Models Through Age 15." Early Childhood Research Quarterly 1, March 1986, 15-45.

Smith, Frank. Insult to Applications: The Bureaucratic Invasion of Our Classrooms. NY: Arbor House, 1986.

Soderman, A.K. and Marian Phillips. "The Early Education of Males: Where Are We Failing Them?" Educational Leadership 44, November 1986, 70-72.

Sponseller, Doris. "Play and Early Education" in Bernard Spodek, ed. Handbook of Research in Early Childhood Education. NY: Free Press, 1982.

Strother, D.B. "Another Look at Time-on-Task." Phi Delta Kappan 65, June 1984, 714-717.

U.S. Department of Education. What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning. Washington: U.S. Department of Education, 1986.

Venezky, Richard, et al. The Subtle Danger: Reflections on the Literacy Abilities of America's Young Adults. Princeton, NY: Educational Testing Service, 1987.

Wyne, M.D. and G.B. Stuck. "Time and Learning: Implications for the Classroom Teacher." The Elementary School Journal 83, September 1982, 67-75.